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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your helpful comments concerning our manuscript entitled “The effect and mechanism of 5-ALA-mediated photodynamic therapy on oral squamous cell carcinoma in vivo and in vitro” (ID: OHEA-D-20-00183R2 ). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. We have uploaded a clean revised text file and the file " Response letter to Reviewers ". The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are list below. Please let us know if there are additional inadequacies in our manuscript. Thank you for your endeavor to facilitate timely publication of our manuscript.

Sincerely,

Liangpeng Xu
Tel/Fax:
E-mail:
Address:, China

We would like to express our sincere thanks to the reviewers for their constructive and positive comments.
Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 1: Dear authors thank you for adding important statements in your work. Please improve English in your work.

Sincerely yours,

Responds: Thank you for reading and commenting on our manuscript. Because I am not a native English speaker, this manuscript has proofread by a language editing company to improve the article for language and style now.

Reviewer

Reviewer 3: Thank you very much for your efforts at revising the manuscript. The background and the literature review related to your study is now clear. Presentation of the experimental results are appropriate except that in Table-4 has columns titled I, II, III and IV which have no reference in the methodology section. To me, the methodology still remains somewhat haphazard and lacks continuity. The description still fails to achieve a logical flow. The steps in the experiment has to be clearly outlined and the flow-on effect from one step to the next in downstream has to be maintained. The objective of describing the methodology should be clear enough for another researcher to be able to duplicate your experiment.

Responds: I am sorry for the inconveniences caused by our half-baked presentation. The groups in Table 4 are blank group and 100mg/L 5-ALA+Laser group, and the columns title I-IV refer to the four stages of the cell cycle. We have made changes in the table to make our expression more explicit. Thank you for carefully reading and commenting on our manuscript, and your constructive suggestion helped us a lot.

Page 6 - line 7 refers to an animal experimental treatment ???

Responds: Our original experimental design included in vivo experiments, but it was not presented in this paper, so we made a mistake in the method part. I am sorry for the inconveniences caused by our mistake, and we have checked and deleted the relevant content now.

We appreciate for Editors and Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.